

**6/21/77 [2]**

Folder Citation: Collection: Office of Staff Secretary; Series: Presidential Files; Folder: 6/21/77 [2]; Container 26

To See Complete Finding Aid:

[http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/findingaids/Staff\\_Secretary.pdf](http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/findingaids/Staff_Secretary.pdf)

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

June 21, 1977

Jim Schlesinger  
Stu Eizenstat  
Hamilton Jordan  
Jack Watson  
Tim Kraft

Re: Proposal for Energy Meeting with  
Fifty Governors

The attached was returned in the President's  
outbox and is forwarded to you for your infor-  
mation and appropriate action.

Rick Hutcheson

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

ACTION	FYI		
		MONDALE	ENROLLED BILL
		COSTANZA	AGENCY REPORT
	X	EIZENSTAT	CAB DECISION
	X	JORDAN	EXECUTIVE ORDER
		LIPSHUTZ	Comments due to
		MOORE	Carp/Huron within
		POWELL	48 hours; due to
	X	WATSON	Staff Secretary
			next day

	FOR STAFFING
	FOR INFORMATION
X	FROM PRESIDENT'S OUTBOX
	LOG IN/TO PRESIDENT TODAY
	IMMEDIATE TURNAROUND

	ARAGON
	BOURNE
	BRZEZINSKI
	BUTLER
	CARP
	H. CARTER
	CLOUGH
	FALLOWS
	FIRST LADY
	GAMMILL
	HARDEN
	HOYT
	HUTCHESON
	JAGODA
	KING

X	KRAFT
	LANCE
	LINDER
	MITCHELL
	POSTON
	PRESS
	B. RAINWATER
X	SCHLESINGER
	SCHNEIDERS
	SCHULTZE
	SIEGEL
	SMITH
	STRAUSS
	WELLS
	VOORDE



THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Electrostatic Copy Made  
for Preservation Purposes

June 16, 1977

*ok - if carefully  
prepared - suggest  
WH/EOB*

*TC*

MEMORANDUM FOR:

THE PRESIDENT

FROM:

*JS*  
JIM SCHLESINGER AND JACK WATSON

SUBJECT:

Proposal for Energy Meeting with Fifty Governors

The National Energy Plan, to be effective, must be coordinated with the ongoing energy programs and problems in the several States. Before April 20 there was not time to learn in detail about regional and local problems and opportunities. Now that a national plan has been developed it is timely to move into a second phase of coordinated action with the States and local governments.

A meeting with all the governors, planned in advance to establish a series of working task forces, would be the most effective way to begin this working partnership.

An important dividend for us will be enhanced understanding and hopefully support for our program before the Congress.

Format

We propose a one and one-half day retreat away from Washington (we are investigating facilities in Maryland and Virginia but could use the White House/EOB). The governors and energy directors would arrive one afternoon and work through the following day. We suggest that you spend about three hours in a work session with them on the morning of the second day.

We have determined from Fran Voorde that you might be available for one morning session on these dates:

Saturday, July 9  
Saturday, July 16  
Sunday, July 10

A more detailed schedule proposal is attached. We anticipate the need and desire for a great deal of substantive preparation by the governors and would appreciate knowing your reaction as soon as possible so that we can inform them of your willingness to discuss these issues.

Attachment

1. Schedule Proposal

### Schedule Proposal

Opening evening session: Small task force meetings with a lead governor moderating the discussions with other governors, staff and appropriate Federal agencies.

Casual, informal dinner and distribution of briefing books.

Morning session: You would open the meeting with Governor Carroll and Governor Askew cochairing. The meeting would be strictly a working session for you, Dr. Schlesinger and the governors.

Some of the topics covered in this session might be:

- o Transportation
- o Role of states in conservation
- o Combined effort on public understanding of energy problem

#### Afternoon Sessions - Second Day

- o Small group discussions among governors and their principal staff with the Energy Policy and Planning staff and other Federal agencies.
  - Transportation issues: the highway funds, mass transit, vanpooling, speed limit enforcement, etc.
  - Supply development issues: rail transportation, impact assistance, siting criteria, etc.
  - Utility reforms: rate reforms, interconnection and wheeling, etc.
  - Residential and building conservation: standards for new construction, coordination of the low-income weatherization program, encouragement for retrofits, etc.
  - New energy resources: action on solar (property taxes, setbacks, consumer protection), biomass and other projects.
  - Information systems: building interactive and cooperative systems.

#### Second Day - Closing

Press conference. The remaining governors and we would provide the press with an indepth review of the meeting and plans.



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Date: June 17, 1977

MEMORANDUM

FOR ACTION:

Tim Kraft

FOR INFORMATION:

FROM: Rick Hutcheson, Staff Secretary

SUBJECT:

Jim Schlesinger and Jack Watson memo dated 6/16/77  
re: Proposal for Energy Meeting with Fifty Governors

YOUR RESPONSE MUST BE DELIVERED  
TO THE STAFF SECRETARY BY:

TIME: 4 P. M.

DAY: MONDAY

DATE: JUNE 20

ACTION REQUESTED:

☒ Your comments  
Other:

STAFF RESPONSE:

☐ I concur.

☐ No comment.

*Please note other comments below:*

**PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.**

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please telephone the Staff Secretary immediately. (Telephone, 7052)



Date: June 17, 1977

MEMORANDUM

FOR ACTION:

Tim Kraft

FOR INFORMATION:

FROM: Rick Hutcheson, Staff Secretary

SUBJECT:

Jim Schlesinger and Jack Watson memo dated 6/16/77  
re: Proposal for Energy Meeting with Fifty GovernorsYOUR RESPONSE MUST BE DELIVERED  
TO THE STAFF SECRETARY BY:

TIME: 4 P.M.

DAY: MONDAY

DATE: JUNE 20

ACTION REQUESTED:

☒ Your comments

Other:

*I'd recommend morning*

STAFF RESPONSE:

☐ I concur.☐ No comment.

Please note other comments below.

*of Sat. July 9 - it would  
follow a 4-day work wk.  
(after the July 4th wk end -)  
But not 3 hrs. - 2 1/2 should  
be enough of the President's time -  
TK*

PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please telephone the Staff Secretary immediately. (Telephone, 7052)



Date: June 17, 1977

MEMORANDUM

## FOR ACTION:

Tim Kraft

## FOR INFORMATION:

FROM: Rick Hutcheson, Staff Secretary

## SUBJECT:

Jim Schlesinger and Jack Watson memo dated 6/16/77  
re: Proposal for Energy Meeting with Fifty Governors

YOUR RESPONSE MUST BE DELIVERED  
TO THE STAFF SECRETARY BY:

TIME: 4 P. M.

DAY: MONDAY

DATE: JUNE 20

## ACTION REQUESTED:

☒ Your comments

Other:

## STAFF RESPONSE:

☐ I concur.☐ No comment.*Please note other comments below:*

PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please telephone the Staff Secretary immediately. (Telephone, 7052)



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 16, 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT  
FROM: JIM SCHLESINGER AND JACK WATSON  
SUBJECT: Proposal for Energy Meeting with Fifty Governors

The National Energy Plan, to be effective, must be coordinated with the ongoing energy programs and problems in the several States. Before April 20 there was not time to learn in detail about regional and local problems and opportunities. Now that a national plan has been developed it is timely to move into a second phase of coordinated action with the States and local governments.

A meeting with all the governors, planned in advance to establish a series of working task forces, would be the most effective way to begin this working partnership.

An important dividend for us will be enhanced understanding and hopefully support for our program before the Congress.

Format

We propose a one and one-half day retreat away from Washington (we are investigating facilities in Maryland and Virginia but could use the White House/EOB). The governors and energy directors would arrive one afternoon and work through the following day. We suggest that you spend about three hours in a work session with them on the morning of the second day.

We have determined from Fran Voorde that you might be available for one morning session on these dates:

Saturday, July 9  
Saturday, July 16  
Sunday, July 10

A more detailed schedule proposal is attached. We anticipate the need and desire for a great deal of substantive preparation by the governors and would appreciate knowing your reaction as soon as possible so that we can inform them of your willingness to discuss these issues.

Attachments: 2

1. Schedule Proposal
2. Specific Actions by States



## Schedule Proposal

Opening evening session: Small task force meetings with a lead governor moderating the discussions with other governors, staff and appropriate Federal agencies.

Casual, informal dinner and distribution of briefing books.

Morning session: You would open the meeting with Governor Carroll and Governor Askew cochairing. The meeting would be strictly a working session for you, Dr. Schlesinger and the governors.

Some of the topics covered in this session might be:

- o Transportation
- o Role of states in conservation
- o Combined effort on public understanding of energy problem

### Afternoon Sessions - Second Day

- o Small group discussions among governors and their principal staff with the Energy Policy and Planning staff and other Federal agencies.
  - Transportation issues: the highway funds, mass transit, vanpooling, speed limit enforcement, etc.
  - Supply development issues: rail transportation, impact assistance, siting criteria, etc.
  - Utility reforms: rate reforms, interconnection and wheeling, etc.
  - Residential and building conservation: standards for new construction, coordination of the low-income weatherization program, encouragement for retrofits, etc.
  - New energy resources: action on solar (property taxes, setbacks, consumer protection), biomass and other projects.
  - Information systems: building interactive and cooperative systems.

### Second Day - Closing

Press conference. The remaining governors and we would provide the press with an indepth review of the meeting and plans.



Specific Actions by States

Transportation

1. Enforce 55 mph speed limit.
2. Encourage alternative transportation modes--mass transit, carpools, vanpooling, exclusive carpool and bus lanes.
3. Assist Federal Government in refashioning the highway program.

Residential and Structural Conservation

4. Develop groups to encourage residential retrofits.
5. Encourage banking community to make loans.
6. Help insure coordination at state level of low income weatherization program, including use of CETA funds.
7. Assist Federal Government and seek rapid implementation of conservation standards for new structures.
8. Make state and local public buildings models of energy efficiency.
9. Develop sound plans for use of Federal matching funds for upgrading schools and hospitals.

Utility Reforms

10. Urge sensible reforms of utility rate structures.
11. Seek opportunities to bring business and utilities together on cogeneration projects.

Supply Development

12. Work with Federal level on streamlining siting criteria.
13. Ensure proper planning and use of Federal funds in meeting needs of the impacted communities.
14. Assist Federal Government in its review of current assistance legislation.
15. Make inputs to study of the national energy transportation system.
16. Make prompt determinations on classifying land under Clean Air Act.



New Energy Resources

17. Take action on exempting solar energy from property tax.
18. Enact legislation to protect solar users on setbacks.
19. Work with the Federal Government on consumer protection--standards, licensing, etc.
20. Use public building as a demonstration of solar.
21. Apply other unconventional energy sources for public purposes, e.g., biomass.
22. Ensure non-discriminatory tax and regulation treatment on new sources, e.g., biomass.

Other

23. Work with the Federal level on design of information systems.
24. Work with Federal level on humane, but well managed emergency assistance program.
25. Examine implications of higher energy costs on land use plans.



THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

3<sup>00</sup> PM



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

MEETING WITH MAX CLELAND  
Tuesday, June 21, 1977  
3:00 p.m. (20 minutes)  
Cabinet Room

FROM: Bert Lance

*Jim McIntyre*

I. PURPOSE

To discuss the creation of a Presidential Commission to study veterans' benefits.

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS, AND PRESS PLAN

- A. Background: This is an extension of the brief discussion of this topic that took place when Max Cleland attended the VA budget session. OMB sees the need to control growth of veterans' programs; believes we are likely to be "nibbled to death" unless we have an overall plan; and feels that such a commission would take some of the heat off the Administration. Max Cleland doesn't think a credible commission can be formed without representation from veterans' service organizations, and that a commission with that representation might recommend further liberalization of benefits. OMB believes that forceful leadership on your part and that of the VA Administrator would make it possible to constitute a useful commission similar to the 1956 Bradley Commission. It was made up of people familiar with veterans and the military but included no advocates. Thorough consultation with veterans' groups would be expected.
- B. Participants: The President, Max Cleland, Bert Lance, Suzanne Woolsey, Jack Watson, Stuart Eizenstat and William Hamm.
- C. Press Plan: White House photo.

**Electrostatic Copy Made  
for Preservation Purposes**



### III. TALKING POINTS

- A. I am deeply committed to two objectives:
  - A balanced Federal budget in FY 1981.
  - Improved care to veterans with service-connected-disabilities.
- B. Both of these objectives are threatened by budget threats now on the horizon:
  - OMB estimates that congressional action during this session could raise 1981 VA outlays by \$1.7 billion over base estimates. Possible add-ons in subsequent sessions could raise this amount to \$3.5-\$4.0 billion.
  - There is not room in the budget for both these add-ons and the funds needed for elderly and service-disabled veterans.
- C. We can't resist the budget threats one-by-one.
  - Benefits of most small additions always seem to outweigh costs.
  - In a \$500 billion budget, the cost of even sizeable threats will be downplayed in favor of "helping veterans."
- D. If we are to meet our objectives, we must develop a strategy for:
  - Countering congressional add-ons.
  - Focusing existing resources on the service-disabled veteran.
- E. OMB has suggested that a Presidential commission on veterans' programs, like the Bradley Commission of the 1950s, could lead to such a strategy by:
  - Providing impartial recommendations for a national policy toward veterans.
  - Minimizing Administration exposure to political repercussions of opposing congressional add-ons in low-priority areas.
  - Getting the Administration off the hook with the service organizations.



If you choose to create a commission:

A. I would like Max to:

- Prepare an Executive Order establishing such a commission.
- Propose details such as candidates for the commission, what issues it should address, how long it would have to complete its work, etc.

B. Need to get results fast.

- Set the process in motion as soon as possible.
- Set earliest reasonable reporting date.

3:00 PM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 21, 1977

MEMORANDUM TO:

THE PRESIDENT

FROM:

STU EIZENSTAT  
FRANK RAINES

SUBJECT:

Meeting with Max Cleland on  
Veterans Benefits Commission

This meeting has been called to discuss Bert Lance's proposal for a commission to study the veterans benefits programs. The hope is that such a commission can give guidance on the scope of the nation's obligation to veterans and thereby prevent threatened expansions in the programs beyond some agreed point.

The veterans benefit programs raise three interrelated policy issues. First, there is no consensus on what benefits should be provided, for how long and at what cost. Second, there is mounting evidence that the services currently being provided are in some cases less than adequate, and in other instances wasteful. Third, the lack of controls on eligibility determination and on use of benefits has made the programs open to abuse.

OMB believes that a commission would be useful to begin to take a look at these issues and to create some momentum for reform. I concur in that view. Despite Max's best efforts it will be difficult to get the old-line bureaucracy at the VA to do a true self-evaluation. Without a commission we will need to devote a considerable amount of the resources of the White House and OMB to insuring that these issues are properly addressed.

Appointing a commission does run the risk of inviting criticism in light of the commission on military compensation and the pension commission. We will also have a political fight to keep the veterans groups off the commission.



An alternative to a commission would be to begin a review of the veterans programs using resources within the Administration. The recent report of the National Academy of Sciences on the VA hospital system could provide a vehicle for the first part of such a review. The Academy study identifies a number of areas where improvements need to be made in the hospital system and makes suggestions for the future of the VA program. The VA has 90 days in which to analyze the study and make a report to Congress. We can take advantage of this opportunity to articulate the Administration's position on at least this one part of the veterans benefit structure.

This second approach is less desirable than having a commission in terms of the staff resources available to do the work. It does avoid some of the political problems.

3:00

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 20, 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT  
FROM: Jack Watson *Jack*  
SUBJECT: MEETING TO DISCUSS BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOR  
VETERANS AFFAIRS - TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 1977 -  
3:00 to 3:20 p.m. - CABINET ROOM

As you know, Bert Lance has suggested that a Blue Ribbon Commission be established to study veterans' benefits. A copy of Bert's memorandum to you describing the Bradley Commission of the 1950's is attached, together with a summary of the staff comments.

Max Cleland feels strongly that it is not a good idea to appoint a Presidential Commission, and that Bert's budget-related objectives would be better achieved by having a task force or commission appointed by Max to review the status and benefits of Vietnam era veterans. I believe that he will make the following points:

- (1) A Bradley type commission would lack credibility with veterans' organizations, the support of which is critically important in getting the commission's recommendations through Congress.
- (2) A Presidential Commission with a broad-ranging agenda to study the Veterans Administration and veterans' benefits in general would be viewed with great fear by veterans' organizations.
- (3) Once a Presidential Commission is appointed and set into motion, it is very difficult to have any control over its recommendations.

Although I don't have a paper from Max on the subject, based on my brief conversation with him, I think he will recommend that you direct him to appoint a task force to study the benefits of Vietnam era veterans over a maximum period of one year. Max argues that by having him appoint the task force, our ability to direct its activities is greater, and you can be somewhat insulated from its operation, while at the same time showing your interest in the subject by having the task force appointed.

In addition to Bert and Max, the following people will attend:

Sue Woolsey, OMB Staff  
Stu Eizenstat  
Frank Raines  
Jack Watson

Rufus Wilson, Deputy Administrator/VA  
Guy McMichael, General Counsel/VA

Attachment



MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

INFORMATION

17 May 1977

TO: THE PRESIDENT  
FROM: RICK HUTCHESON *Rich*  
SUBJECT: Summary of Staff Comments on  
Attached Lance Memo

Watson: concurs with Lance suggestions, and recommends that the President meet with Max Cleland. Watson says Cleland plans to ask to meet with the President shortly to discuss the VA, in any case.

Siegel: warns that the Administration should be very careful about taking any action which would appear to be renegeing on our commitments to veterans.

Eizenstat: agrees with Lance about the potential budget threat from veterans benefits. He observes that 45% of the population is eligible for veterans benefits, and that the FY 1978 budget request for veterans is \$19.1 billion.

Stu concurs with Lance's proposed commission to examine the nature of veterans benefits, but recommends that this effort be coordinated with DoD's commission on military compensation. It is possible that the two efforts can be combined.

Stu also recommends that Max Cleland be invited to attend Cabinet meetings.



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

MAY 17 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT  
FROM: Bert Lance *BL*  
SUBJECT: Prospects for Success of a "Bradley-type"  
Commission to Review Veterans' Programs

In our conversation about a new Bradley Commission to study veterans' benefits, you asked about the risk that such a commission might recommend further liberalizations. In assessing this risk, it seems useful to review the composition, procedures, conclusions, and recommendations of the original Bradley Commission.

Composition

The Commission members were selected in such a way that their interests and expertise roughly paralleled major veterans' benefits programs. The members were:

General Omar N. Bradley, World War II General of the  
Armies and VA Administrator 1945-1947  
Clarence G. Adamy, field director of the National  
Citizens Committee for Educational Television  
William J. Donovan, attorney and World War II Director  
of the Office of Strategic Services  
Paul R. Hawley, director of the American College  
of Surgeons  
Martin D. Jenkins, president of Morgan State College  
Theodore S. Peterson, president of the Standard  
Oil Company of California  
John S. Thompson, vice chairman of the board, Mutual  
Benefit Life Insurance Company

The selection of commission members carefully avoided leaders of veterans' organizations, and depended on non-advocates to guarantee objective conclusions and recommendations.



## Procedure

The Commission was careful to provide veterans' groups ample opportunities to make input. Letters were sent to every national veterans' service organization requesting their views on what issues the Commission should study, and their help in developing information pertaining to those issues. Later, veterans' organizations were briefed on principal factual findings, and were given opportunities to present their views on each issue.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

The Bradley Commission recommended that:

- Special veterans' benefits should be provided only for the significant requirements of veterans that arise directly out of their military service.
- The ordinary or non-service-connected needs which veterans have in common with all citizens should be met wherever possible through the general welfare programs under which veterans are covered along with other people. Veterans' non-service-connected benefits should be minimized and gradually eliminated.
- The Government in general, and the executive branch in particular, should adopt a positive policy toward meeting fully and promptly the legitimate needs of veterans. This policy should have the aim of alleviating war-incurred handicaps of servicemen as early as possible after separation and helping them become productive and useful members of their communities. The provision of constructive and adequate readjustment benefits, as a rule, should discharge the Government's obligation to war veterans who have no service-connected disability.
- Because the heaviest cost of veterans pension legislation lie in the future, enactment of veterans pension legislation should be preceded by a careful long-range look ahead to make sure that socially and financially unsound provisions are not adopted. We should not commit future generations to obligations that we ourselves are unwilling to shoulder. Excessive commitments might jeopardize the valid programs and in so doing deprive the aging veterans of compensation at a time when most needed.



- As a Nation we should keep the whole range of our needs in perspective. We ought to make sure that we meet the high-priority service-connected needs of our veterans--and this is fully within our means and our volition as a Nation. However, it would be dangerous to overemphasize veterans' non-service-connected benefit programs at the expense of essential national security and other general public programs.

(As you know, the Congress as well as past Administrations have disregarded these recommendations. Each military conflict has produced a new round of benefit legislation, usually liberalizing benefits given to earlier veterans. In addition, there has been a tendency for the readjustment period to be lengthened, and readjustment benefits made permanent.)

### Conclusion

I believe the creation of a commission would be a useful way to develop guidelines for containing further expansion of veterans' benefits. The probability that the commission would itself become an advocate for liberalization can be greatly reduced if the members are selected judiciously and the objectives are assigned carefully. I believe we can fruitfully follow the precedent of the Bradley Commission in this regard.





EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

MEETING WITH MAX CLELAND  
Tuesday, June 21, 1977  
3:00 p.m. (20 minutes)  
Cabinet Room

FROM: Bert Lance

*Jim McIntyre*

I. PURPOSE

To discuss the creation of a Presidential Commission to study veterans' benefits.

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS, AND PRESS PLAN

- A. Background: This is an extension of the brief discussion of this topic that took place when Max Cleland attended the VA budget session. OMB sees the need to control growth of veterans' programs; believes we are likely to be "nibbled to death" unless we have an overall plan; and feels that such a commission would take some of the heat off the Administration. Max Cleland doesn't think a credible commission can be formed without representation from veterans' service organizations, and that a commission with that representation might recommend further liberalization of benefits. OMB believes that forceful leadership on your part and that of the VA Administrator would make it possible to constitute a useful commission similar to the 1956 Bradley Commission. It was made up of people familiar with veterans and the military but included no advocates. Thorough consultation with veterans' groups would be expected.
- B. Participants: The President, Max Cleland, Bert Lance, Suzanne Woolsey, Jack Watson, Stuart Eizenstat and William Hamm.
- C. Press Plan: White House photo.

### III. TALKING POINTS

- A. I am deeply committed to two objectives:
  - A balanced Federal budget in FY 1981.
  - Improved care to veterans with service-connected-disabilities.
- B. Both of these objectives are threatened by budget threats now on the horizon:
  - OMB estimates that congressional action during this session could raise 1981 VA outlays by \$1.7 billion over base estimates. Possible add-ons in subsequent sessions could raise this amount to \$3.5-\$4.0 billion.
  - There is not room in the budget for both these add-ons and the funds needed for elderly and service-disabled veterans.
- C. We can't resist the budget threats one-by-one.
  - Benefits of most small additions always seem to outweigh costs.
  - In a \$500 billion budget, the cost of even sizeable threats will be downplayed in favor of "helping veterans."
- D. If we are to meet our objectives, we must develop a strategy for:
  - Countering congressional add-ons.
  - Focusing existing resources on the service-disabled veteran.
- E. OMB has suggested that a Presidential commission on veterans' programs, like the Bradley Commission of the 1950s, could lead to such a strategy by:
  - Providing impartial recommendations for a national policy toward veterans.
  - Minimizing Administration exposure to political repercussions of opposing congressional add-ons in low-priority areas.
  - Getting the Administration off the hook with the service organizations.



If you choose to create a commission:

A. I would like Max to:

- Prepare an Executive Order establishing such a commission.
- Propose details such as candidates for the commission, what issues it should address, how long it would have to complete its work, etc.

B. Need to get results fast.

- Set the process in motion as soon as possible.
- Set earliest reasonable reporting date.

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

June 21, 1977

The Vice President

The attached was returned in  
the President's outbox. It is  
forwarded to you for appropriate  
handling.

Rick Hutcheson

cc: Hamilton Jordan  
Frank Moore

Re: Universal Voter Registration



THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

June 21, 1977

Ken Curtis -

The attached was returned in  
the President's outbox. It is  
forwarded to you for your  
information.

Rick Hutcheson

Re: Universal Voter Registration

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

June 21, 1977

Paul Sullivan -

The attached was returned in  
the President's outbox. It is  
forwarded to you for your  
information.

Rick Hutcheson

Re: Universal Voter Registration



THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

*cc Paul Sullivan /DNC  
Ken Curtis*

ACTION	FYI
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MONDALE
<input type="checkbox"/>	COSTANZA
<input type="checkbox"/>	EIZENSTAT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	JORDAN
<input type="checkbox"/>	LIPSHUTZ
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MOORE
<input type="checkbox"/>	POWELL
<input type="checkbox"/>	WATSON

<input type="checkbox"/>	ENROLLED BILL
<input type="checkbox"/>	AGENCY REPORT
<input type="checkbox"/>	CAB DECISION
<input type="checkbox"/>	EXECUTIVE ORDER

Comments due to  
Carp/Huron within  
48 hours; due to  
Staff Secretary  
next day

<input type="checkbox"/>	FOR STAFFING
<input type="checkbox"/>	FOR INFORMATION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FROM PRESIDENT'S OUTBOX
<input type="checkbox"/>	LOG IN/TO PRESIDENT TODAY
<input type="checkbox"/>	IMMEDIATE TURNAROUND

<input type="checkbox"/>	ARAGON
<input type="checkbox"/>	BOURNE
<input type="checkbox"/>	BRZEZINSKI
<input type="checkbox"/>	BUTLER
<input type="checkbox"/>	CARP
<input type="checkbox"/>	H. CARTER
<input type="checkbox"/>	CLOUGH
<input type="checkbox"/>	FALLOWS
<input type="checkbox"/>	FIRST LADY
<input type="checkbox"/>	GAMMILL
<input type="checkbox"/>	HARDEN
<input type="checkbox"/>	HOYT
<input type="checkbox"/>	HUTCHESON
<input type="checkbox"/>	JAGODA
<input type="checkbox"/>	KING

<input type="checkbox"/>	KRAFT
<input type="checkbox"/>	LANCE
<input type="checkbox"/>	LINDER
<input type="checkbox"/>	MITCHELL
<input type="checkbox"/>	POSTON
<input type="checkbox"/>	PRESS
<input type="checkbox"/>	B. RAINWATER
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHLESINGER
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHNEIDERS
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHULTZE
<input type="checkbox"/>	SIEGEL
<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH
<input type="checkbox"/>	STRAUSS
<input type="checkbox"/>	WELLS
<input type="checkbox"/>	VOORDE


DEMOCRATIC  
NATIONAL COMMITTEE

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

1625 Massachusetts Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 797-5900

MEMORANDUM

*Fritz -  
Excellent report -  
act - call on me  
if necessary  
J*

To: The President  
From: Paul Sullivan   
Date: June 20, 1977

---

Per your request, attached please find a list of the State Chairmen and their opinions on UVR. For your information, I have also attached a brief state-by-state UVR analysis that was completed by the DNC Field Staff approximately two weeks ago.

**Electrostatic Copy Made  
for Preservation Purposes**



STATE CHAIRPERSONS -- UVR TALLY

ALABAMA

Robert Vance -- For

ALASKA

Gordon Evans -- Unknown

ARIZONA

Mathew Wheeler -- For

ARKANSAS

Herbie Branscum -- For

CALIFORNIA

Bert Coffey -- For

COLORADO

Shetla Kowal -- For

CONNECTICUT

William O'Neill -- Privately Against

DELAWARE

Henry Topel -- For

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Robert Washington -- For

FLORIDA

Alfredo Duran -- For

GEORGIA

Marge Thurman -- For

HAWAII

Minoru Hirabara -- Unknown

IDAHO

Les Purce -- Unknown

ILLINOIS

Jack Touhy -- Against

INDIANA

Bill Trisler -- For

IOWA

Ed Campbell -- Unknown

KANSAS

Terry Scanlon -- For

KENTUCKY  
Howard Hunt -- Against

LOUISIANA  
Jesse Bankston -- For

MAINE  
Harold Pachios -- For

MARYLAND  
Senator Roy Staten -- Unknown

MASSACHUSETTS  
Charles Flaherty -- For

MICHIGAN  
Morley Winograd -- For

MINNESOTA  
Ulric Scott -- For

MISSISSIPPI  
Aaron Henry -- For      Tom Riddell -- Against (?)

MISSOURI  
Bill Naurer -- For

MONTANA  
John Bartlett -- For

NEBRASKA  
Dick White -- For

NEVADA  
Didi Carson -- For

NEW HAMPSHIRE  
Joanne Symons -- For

NEW JERSEY  
Dick Coffee -- For

NEW MEXICO  
Dan Croy -- For

NEW YORK  
Dominic Baranello -- For

NORTH CAROLINA  
Betty McCain -- Unknown

NORTH DAKOTA  
Dick Ista -- Undecided

OHIO  
Paul Tipps -- For



OKLAHOMA

Bob Funston -- For

OREGON

James Klonoski -- For

PENNSYLVANIA

Harvey Thiemann -- For

RHODE ISLAND

Joe DiStefano -- Against

SOUTH CAROLINA

Don Fowler -- For

SOUTH DAKOTA

Herb Cheever -- Undecided

TENNESSEE

William Farris -- For

TEXAS

Calvin Guest -- For

UTAH

Ron Swenson -- For

VERMONT

John Carnahan -- Privately Against

VIRGINIA

Joe Fitzpatrick -- Unknown

WASHINGTON

Neal Chaney -- For

WEST VIRGINIA

J.C. Dillon -- For

WISCONSIN

Mike Bleicher -- For

WYOMING

Don Anselmi -- For

## UNIVERSAL VOTER REGISTRATION

Over the past two weeks the Field Operations staff has conducted a campaign of support identification for the Universal Voter Registration Bill on a state by state basis. As information regarding the bill becomes available to state and local officials, a more precise picture of its current status develops.

There is broad support for U.V.R. in California. The Secretary of State and the State Treasurer are supportive of the measure. The only visible opposition comes from some county Election Clerks. There is a good possibility the bill may be introduced this legislative session. No clear reading has been received as to the position of the legislative leadership or the Governor, but it is expected they will support the measure as the balance of elected Democrats and state party leaders close ranks in support of the bill.

The Washington State Legislature is also expected to readily support U.V.R. Both the House and Senate are overwhelmingly Democratic and have in the past supported electoral reform. It is too late to introduce the legislation this year but it will certainly be considered during next year's session. A special session is not beyond possibility.

A different situation exists in Oregon, where no clear reading of the bill's reception can yet be made. The state's Carter coordinator is trying to identify potential supporters. Serious questions regarding the possibility of fraud seem to exist. The legislative package we have sent to them does not appear to answer their questions in this matter.

With the question of fraud as their main argument, opponents of the measure seem to have the upper hand in Alaska, Arizona, Hawaii, and Idaho. Of these four states, Hawaii is the most likely one to take positive action on the bill. Once the question of the Mayor of Honolulu's indictment is resolved, we may be able to reassure them on their doubts regarding fraud. The other three states present more difficult problems since, in addition to questions regarding fraud, serious political struggles between Democrats and Republicans are in progress. No headway is likely in these states until the national legislation is enacted and states begin to comply with it.

Better future prospects appear in Montana where support for the legislation is expected from all major elected officials except the Secretary of State. It is too late for the measure to be introduced this year, and a special session is most unlikely. If the bill fares well at the national level, its introduction next year can be safely predicted.

The reaction to U.V.R. in Wyoming and Utah has been generally unenthusiastic. In Wyoming the Republican Secretary of State opposes the bill and no major state-wide official has endorsed it. It will probably be introduced next year but may have a difficult time being passed. In Utah, the Governor and State Party Officials favor it; however, no enthusiastic support for the measure is seen. The bill will probably be introduced next session but no reading as to its chances for enactment are available at this time.



Colorado has attempted in the past, without success, to enact similar legislation. A bill to this effect is now being considered and has the support of the Governor and the State Election Commission. The introduction of the national legislation has given the state's efforts new credibility. It is possible that it may pass this session.

No clear reading as to the bill's prospects can be secured from Kansas or South Dakota. In both states, elected Democrats and state party officials support U.V.R. but Republicans have opposed it historically. No real action on the bill can be expected before the national legislation is enacted.

North Dakota presents a special case since there is no voter registration. They do not like registration in principle, but it is possible that they may comply after Congress enacts the legislation. We are getting more information as to how their system works.

In Nebraska and Iowa reaction to U.V.R. has been extremely positive. Iowa is expected to enact the legislation by April 30th. In Nebraska the state press and Omaha's elected officials are very supportive. Major state elected officials are behind it except for the Secretary of State. Prospects look good for passage next session.

A more complicated picture emerges in Missouri. Urban leaders in St. Louis and state party officials are very supportive of the measure. The Speaker of the House is openly favorable while the State Senate President is undecided. Main opposition comes from the Secretary of State and urban leaders in Kansas City. No action is expected on the bill this year.

Universal Voter Registration seems to pick-up wide support in Indiana. The Secretary of State and the northwest Mayors are openly in favor of the measure. Governor Lugar (R) is impressed with the concept and may endorse it. The Congressional delegation is generally supportive. Only the State Legislative leaders seem to be undecided and no action is expected this year.

Broad support for the bill also exists in Michigan. Labor, the State Party, and key state-wide officials support the measure. The state now has a liberal registration system tied to driver's licenses. It will only modify its system if the national legislation is enacted.

In Ohio a bill apparently in compliance with the federal legislation appears ready for passage. Support may be sufficient to override a veto by Governor Rhodes.

Illinois reaction to the Universal Voter Registration bill continues to be mixed. Secretary of State Alan Dixon, a Democrat with very close ties to the Chicago organization, is strongly in favor of the bill. Governor Thompson seems undecided as to what position to take. The independents oppose it because of the dangers of fraud. The regulars are, at least verbally, opposed to it. We have not been able to secure a clear reading of the prospects for the measure's passage.

Of all the states giving U.V.R. a positive reception, Arkansas presents

the most complex case of all. The measure is receiving support from most state-wide elected officials, the party and the press. However, a recently enacted state statute created an Elections Commission charged with the responsibility of redoing the code. The Commission is in the process of selecting its citizen members and until it is properly constituted it will not be able to act. It is expected that the Commission will support U.V.R. and recommend its enactment. No action is expected until next session.

In Texas and Oklahoma the reaction to U.V.R. has been either negative or noncommittal. In Oklahoma the state press has been highly critical of the bill, pointing out the possibilities for fraud that it would create. Currently a postcard registration bill is under consideration, but it has no realistic chance for enactment. No major effort is expected on U.V.R. this year. In Texas, the state party appears ready to lead the way on behalf of U.V.R. Although several election reform measures are under consideration in the state legislature, none of these deal with U.V.R. Governor Briscoe is currently uncommitted. The Secretary of State is opposed to U.V.R. No realistic chance for enactment of this measure is seen until next year.

New Mexico has raised some interesting questions as to how to purge voter lists under the new method; no method is provided in the legislation. Once this question and the usual inquiries about fraud are answered, no other major opposition seems apparent. Prospects look good for passage in 1978.

Universal Voter Registration will have a difficult time in most of the "Deep South" states. In Louisiana, it appears that only the enactment of the federal bill will provide the motivation necessary for passage. No clear reading has emerged from Alabama. George Wallace is undecided on this issue and most elected officials will probably take their cue from him. In both states the party is generally supportive of the measure.

Both factions of the Mississippi Democratic Party support Universal Voter Registration. The bill will be introduced at the next session. Legislative leadership seems to be undecided. Enactment of the federal law is almost a prerequisite to secure state passage in Mississippi.

In Georgia the Secretary of State, Ben <sup>Fortson</sup> ~~Foster~~, opposes U.V.R. Legislators that have supported Carter favor it, but prefer to wait until redistricting gives urban areas more representation. The state party is not enthusiastic about it and most conservatives seem to oppose it. There is no chance for the legislation to pass this year.

Governor Rubin Askew has proposed a Universal Voter Registration Bill in Florida. His proposal has run into serious opposition from the state press and the local Supervisors of Elections. The State Supervisor of Elections, Mary Singelton, an appointed official, is against it. Her boss, the Secretary of State, is running for office and has not taken a position on the bill. The most serious questions raised against it are fraud and large crowds at urban polling places on election day. They are also concerned over proper precinct assignment in urban areas. Finally, opponents point-out that no method is written in the law to insure that the state will pass the federal funds onto the counties, which are essentially the



administrative centers for the elections. The Governor's bill is not given a good chance of passing this year. The state party is supportive of the measure and will work for it. Once the basic questions that are being raised are resolved, the bill's prospects will improve.

South Carolina's state party officials support the legislation. However, state and local election officials oppose the measure. The state legislature is no longer in session and no legislative leader for the measure has emerged as of now. Prospects for the near future are not good.

In North Carolina, some key legislative leaders support the measure. Governor Hunt has shown no interest in U.V.R., but the state party is very supportive. The legislature is no longer in session this year, and the 1978 session will be limited to fiscal matters with a 2/3 vote necessary to change the rules. Prospects for enactment in the 1979 session are very good, however.

The Tennessee Legislature has a Universal Registration Bill in committee at this time. The legislative leadership is undecided but the Secretary of State and the party both support it. Prospects for enactment at this time are not clear.

In Kentucky, Governor Carroll and the Secretary of State will probably support it, if Jimmy Carter asks them to do so. The state legislature will meet again in 1978 and the bill could pass if the proper support is arranged.

The 1977 Virginia Legislative Session has already adjourned. This may well be fortunate since no support for U.V.R. is visible in the state at this time. The possibility of fraud is the most often used argument against it and even legislators who philosophically would support it will not do so until this question is dealt with. The Governor and the Secretary of State, both Republicans, are opposed to it. Future prospects are dim.

Universal Voter Registration has not created much interest in Maryland. Labor and the state party support it but there are too many other issues of interest in the state ahead of U.V.R. It is difficult to get a reading as to the bill's prospects in Maryland at this time.

Somewhat better prospects seem to exist in West Virginia where the Secretary of State and the Mayor of Charleston support the measure. Party officials and the Governor seem undecided at this time. There is going to be a special session of the legislature in July, but the big issue will be the budget. Jay Rockefeller is having problems with the legislature. Prospects may be better next year.

In Delaware the Republican Governor is opposed to it. Most Democratic leaders are undecided. No action is expected at this time.

In Pennsylvania and New Jersey the prospects for action are much better. Both Governors are introducing the measure this session and no major opposition has emerged. Labor and the state parties are very supportive. It is



possible that both states may enact legislation this year. If not, prospects for 1978 would be very good.

In New York, enactment of the federal law is viewed almost as a prerequisite for state action. Secretary of State Cuomo likes the idea. The legislature has been adjourned over Easter. If Congress passes U.V.R., New York will probably follow suit.

Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Maine appear favorable to U.V.R. once a national bill is enacted. Some questions about fraud linger but compliance with a federal statute is expected.

In Connecticut and Vermont fraud is a real issue. Better answers to this problem need to be developed. No action in the near future is expected. Again, these two states would probably change their state laws to comply with a federal law.

A study is being currently carried on in Rhode Island, designed to modify the current election law. Most state elected Democrats are not enchanted with U.V.R., but could be persuaded to support it. Again, state enactment would only follow national action.

In review, two main points become evident. First, the question of possible fraud under U.V.R. must be addressed forcefully and clearly. Secondly, most states are not inclined to change their election statutes unless prompted by federal legislation. The enactment of the federal bill is a prerequisite to acceptance of Universal Voter Registration in most states.



U.V.R. TALLY SHEET

ALABAMA

Governor George Wallace -- Undecided  
Secretary of State Agnes Beggett -- Against

ARKANSAS

Governor David Pryor -- Publically Supports  
Secretary of State Winston Bryant -- Privately Supports

California

Governor Jerry Brown -- Undecided  
Secretary of State March Fong Eu -- Publically Supports

COLORADO

Governor Lamm -- Publically Supports

CONNECTICUT

Governor Ella Grasso -- Against  
Secretary of State Gloria Schaffer -- Publically Supports

DELAWARE

Governor Pierre DuPont (R) -- Against  
Secretary of State Louis Wrightson -- Against

FLORIDA

Governor Reubin Askew -- Publically Supports  
Secretary of State Bruce Smathers -- Against

GEORGIA

Secretary of State Ben Fortson -- Against

ILLINOIS

Governor James Thompson (R) -- Against  
Secretary of State Allen Dixon -- Publically Supports

INDIANA

Governor Otis Bowen (R) -- Against  
Secretary of State Larry Conrad -- Undecided

KENTUCKY

Governor Julian Carroll -- Undecided  
Secretary of State Drexel Davis -- Undecided

LOUISIANA

Governor Edwin Edwards -- Against  
Secretary of State Paul Hardy -- Against

MAINE

Secretary of State Mark Gartley -- Publically Supports

MARYLAND

Governor Marvin Mandel -- Against  
Secretary of State Fred Wineland -- Publically Supports

MASSACHUSETTS

Governor Michael Dukakis -- Privately Supports  
Secretary of State Paul Guzzi -- Privately Supports

MINNESOTA

Governor Rudy Perpich-- Publically Supports  
Secretary of State Joan Anderson Growe -- Publically Supports

MICHIGAN

Governor Milliken (R) -- Against  
Secretary of State Richard Austin -- Publically Supports

MISSISSIPPI

Governor Finch -- Undecided



MISSOURI

Governor Teasdale -- Publically Supports

MONTANA

Governor Judge -- Publically Supports

NEBRASKA

Governor Jim Exon -- Publically Supports

NEVADA

Governor O'Callaghan -- Undecided

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Governor Thompson (R) -- Against  
Secretary of State William Gardner

NEW JERSEY

Governor Brendan Byrne -- Privately Supports  
Secretary of State George Lee -- Undecided

NEW MEXICO

Governor Jerry Apodaca -- Publically Supports

NEW YORK

Secretary of State Mario Coumo -- Privately Supports

NORTH CAROLINA

Governor Jim Hunt -- Undecided

NORTH DAKOTA

Governor Link -- Publically Supports

OHIO

Governor James Rhodes(R) -- Against  
Secretary of State Brown (R) -- Against

OKLAHOMA

Governor David Boren -- Publically Supports

PENNSYLVANIA

Governor Milton Shapp -- Privately Supports  
Secretary of State Delores Tucker -- Publically Supports

RHODE ISLAND

Governor Joe Garrahy (R) -- Privately Supports  
Secretary of State Robert Burns -- Against

SOUTH CAROLINA

Governor Jim Edwards (R)

SOUTH DAKOTA

Governor Kneip -- Publically Supports  
Secretary of State Lerna Herseth -- Publically Supports

TENNESSEE

Secretary of State Gentry Crowell -- Undecided

TEXAS

Governor Dolph Briscoe -- Against  
Secretary of State Mark White -- Leaning Against

UTAH

Governor Scott Mathuson -- Publically Supports

VERMONT

Governor Richard Snelling (R)  
Secretary of State James Guest -- Publically Supports

WASHINGTON

Governor Dixie Lee Ray -- Publically Supports

WYOMING

Governor Herschell -- Publically Supports



THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

ACTION			
FYI			
		MONDALE	<input type="checkbox"/> ENROLLED BILL
		COSTANZA	<input type="checkbox"/> AGENCY REPORT
		EIZENSTAT	<input type="checkbox"/> CAB DECISION
		JORDAN	<input type="checkbox"/> EXECUTIVE ORDER
		LIPSHUTZ	Comments due to
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MOORE	Carp/Huron within
		POWELL	48 hours; due to
		WATSON	Staff Secretary
			next day

	FOR STAFFING
	FOR INFORMATION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FROM PRESIDENT'S OUTBOX
	LOG IN/TO PRESIDENT TODAY
	IMMEDIATE TURNAROUND

	ARAGON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	KRAFT
	BOURNE		LANCE
	BRZEZINSKI		LINDER
	BUTLER		MITCHELL
	CARP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	POSTON
	H. CARTER		PRESS
	CLOUGH		B. RAINWATER
	FALLOWS		SCHLESINGER
	FIRST LADY		SCHNEIDERS
	GAMMILL		SCHULTZE
	HARDEN		SIEGEL
	HOYT		SMITH
	HUTCHESON		STRAUSS
	JAGODA		WELLS
	KING		VOORDE

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

June 21, 1977

Frank Moore  
Gretchen Poston  
Tim Kraft

The attached was returned in the  
President's outbox and is forwarded  
to you for your information and  
appropriate action.

Rick Hutcheson

Re: Congressional Picnics



THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

June 14, 1977

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

*Frank & Gretchen -  
Always get Rosalynn's  
Comments first.*

*I suggest Demo & Reps  
strictly limited to spouses  
& children no exceptions.*

*J*

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: FRANK MOORE *FM*

Attached is a memorandum from Gretchen Poston outlining the scenario for a possible picnic in honor of Congressional families.

I recommend that you approve the idea of a Congressional picnic. I believe it would be very well received on the Hill.

APPROVE ✓

DISAPPROVE Subject to above  
Comment

NOTE: Gretchen's cost figures are based on 500 guests per picnic. 2-3 would be needed to accomodate the Democratic Members of Congress. She is thinking of dividing up the guests based on the age of the Member's children.

Rick

Electrostatic Copy Made  
for Preservation Purposes

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 14, 1977

MEMORANDUM TO: FRANK MOORE  
FROM : GRETCHEN POSTON  
SUBJECT: CONGRESSIONAL FAMILY PICNICS

Several Congressmen and Senators have written asking that a group from their home district be invited to the White House to perform.

For a picnic honoring the Congressional families, the following format could be followed:

I. Entertainment

On the South Grounds, four focal/entertainment areas. In each of the areas, entertainment divided and selected by age interest. For example, younger children entertained with puppet shows, clowns, cloggers, etc.

Other areas for older children featuring blue-grass bands, folk music, and square dancing.

Jazz bands would be in still another area for teen-agers.

The groups would be selected from our files with emphasis, if possible, placed on those with Congressional interest. All groups are non-professionals.

II. Food

One of the following menus would be used. Food served from bright tents on the South Grounds.

Hamburgers ( based on 500 guests)	\$311.58
Potato Salad	62.50
Baked beans	68.40
Cole Slaw	87.00
Ice cream	160.00
Soda	98.00
Ice Tea	39.00
Plates, napkins, forks, spoons	72.38
Labor	396.00

TOTAL \$1,294.86



Hot dogs (based on 500 guests)	454.74
Potato salad	62.50
Baked beans	68.40
Cole slaw	87.00
Ice cream	160.00
Soda	98.00
Ice Tea	39.00
Plates, napkins, forks, spoons	72.38
Labor	<u>396.00</u>

TOTAL \$1,438.02

Chicken-1/2 breast	312.50
Leg/thigh (together)	86.25
Potatoes	31.00
Mayonnaise	16.80
Celery	7.20
Relish	2.69
Eggs	4.74
Baked Beans	68.40
Cole Slaw	87.00
Ice Cream	160.00
Sodas	98.00
Ice Tea	39.00
Paper plates, napkins, forks, spoons	72.38
Labor	<u>504.00</u>

TOTAL \$1,489.96

For per person planning, I have adjusted the figures somewhat to allow some flexibility.

Chicken per person @ 500 guests:	\$3.38	_____
Hot dogs per person @ 500 guests:	\$3.37	_____
Hamburgers per person @ 500 guests:	\$3.10	_____

Approved \_\_\_\_\_

Disapproved \_\_\_\_\_

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Date: June 15, 1977

MEMORANDUM

FOR ACTION:

Mrs. Carter *lower*

FOR INFORMATION:

Frank Moore  
Gretchen Poston

FROM: Rick Hutcheson, Staff Secretary

SUBJECT:

Frank Moore's memo regarding  
Congressional Picnics

YOUR RESPONSE MUST BE DELIVERED  
TO THE STAFF SECRETARY BY:

TIME:

DAY:

DATE:

ACTION REQUESTED:

Other: ☒ Your comments - as requested by the President.

STAFF RESPONSE:

☐ I concur.

☐ No comment.

*Please note other comments below:*

**PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.**

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please telephone the Staff Secretary immediately. (Telephone, 7052)



THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

*stay to BSC to*  
*comment*

ACTION  
FYI

<input type="checkbox"/>	MONDALE
<input type="checkbox"/>	COSTANZA
<input type="checkbox"/>	EIZENSTAT
<input type="checkbox"/>	JORDAN
<input type="checkbox"/>	LIPSHUTZ
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MOORE
<input type="checkbox"/>	POWELL
<input type="checkbox"/>	WATSON

<input type="checkbox"/>	ENROLLED BILL
<input type="checkbox"/>	AGENCY REPORT
<input type="checkbox"/>	CAB DECISION
<input type="checkbox"/>	EXECUTIVE ORDER

Comments due to  
Carp/Huron within  
48 hours; due to  
Staff Secretary  
next day

<input type="checkbox"/>	FOR STAFFING
<input type="checkbox"/>	FOR INFORMATION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FROM PRESIDENT'S OUTBOX
<input type="checkbox"/>	LOG IN/TO PRESIDENT TODAY
<input type="checkbox"/>	IMMEDIATE TURNAROUND

<input type="checkbox"/>	ARAGON
<input type="checkbox"/>	BOURNE
<input type="checkbox"/>	BRZEZINSKI
<input type="checkbox"/>	BUTLER
<input type="checkbox"/>	CARP
<input type="checkbox"/>	H. CARTER
<input type="checkbox"/>	CLOUGH
<input type="checkbox"/>	FALLOWS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FIRST LADY
<input type="checkbox"/>	GAMMILL
<input type="checkbox"/>	HARDEN
<input type="checkbox"/>	HOYT
<input type="checkbox"/>	HUTCHESON
<input type="checkbox"/>	JAGODA
<input type="checkbox"/>	KING

<input type="checkbox"/>	KRAFT
<input type="checkbox"/>	LANCE
<input type="checkbox"/>	LINDER
<input type="checkbox"/>	MITCHELL
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	POSTON
<input type="checkbox"/>	PRESS
<input type="checkbox"/>	B. RAINWATER
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHLESINGER
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHNEIDERS
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHULTZE
<input type="checkbox"/>	SIEGEL
<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH
<input type="checkbox"/>	STRAUSS
<input type="checkbox"/>	WELLS
<input type="checkbox"/>	VOORDE

Date: June 15, 1977

MEMORANDUM

## FOR ACTION:

Mrs. Carter

## FOR INFORMATION:

Frank Moore  
Gretchen Poston

FROM: Rick Hutcheson, Staff Secretary

## SUBJECT:

Frank Moore's memo regarding  
Congressional PicnicsYOUR RESPONSE MUST BE DELIVERED  
TO THE STAFF SECRETARY BY:

TIME:

DAY:

DATE:

## ACTION REQUESTED:

☒ Your comments - as requested by the President.  
Other:

## STAFF RESPONSE:

☐ I concur. ☐ No comment.  
*Please note other comments below:***PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.**

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please telephone the Staff Secretary immediately. (Telephone, 7052)



THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

June 14, 1977

*Frank & Gretchen -  
Always get Rosalynn's  
Comments first.*

*I suggest Demo & Reps  
strictly limited to spouses  
& children - no exceptions.*

*F*

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: FRANK MOORE *FM*

Attached is a memorandum from Gretchen Poston outlining the scenario for a possible picnic in honor of Congressional families.

I recommend that you approve the idea of a Congressional picnic. I believe it would be very well received on the Hill.

APPROVE \_\_\_\_\_ DISAPPROVE \_\_\_\_\_

NOTE: Gretchen's cost figures are based on 500 guests per picnic. 2-3 would be needed to accomodate the Democratic Members of Congress. She is thinking of dividing up the guests based on the age of the Member's children.

Rick

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 14, 1977

MEMORANDUM TO:

FRANK MOORE

FROM :

GRETCHEN POSTON

SUBJECT:

CONGRESSIONAL FAMILY PICNICS

Several Congressmen and Senators have written asking that a group from their home district be invited to the White House to perform.

For a picnic honoring the Congressional families, the following format could be followed:

I. Entertainment

On the South Grounds, four focal/entertainment areas. In each of the areas, entertainment divided and selected by age interest. For example, younger children entertained with puppet shows, clowns, cloggers, etc.

Other areas for older children featuring blue-grass bands, folk music, and square dancing.

Jazz bands would be in still another area for teen-agers.

The groups would be selected from our files with emphasis, if possible, placed on those with Congressional interest. All groups are non-professionals.

II. Food

One of the following menus would be used. Food served from bright tents on the South Grounds.

Hamburgers ( based on 500 guests)	\$311.58
Potato Salad	62.50
Baked beans	68.40
Cole Slaw	87.00
Ice cream	160.00
Soda	98.00
Ice Tea	39.00
Plates, napkins, forks, spoons	72.38
Labor	396.00

TOTAL

---

\$1,294.86



Hot dogs (based on 500 guests)	454.74
Potato salad	62.50
Baked beans	68.40
Cole slaw	87.00
Ice cream	160.00
Soda	98.00
Ice Tea	39.00
Plates, napkins, forks, spoons	72.38
Labor	<u>396.00</u>

TOTAL	\$1,438.02
-------	------------

Chicken-1/2 breast	312.50
Leg/thigh (together)	86.25
Potatoes	31.00
Mayonnaise	16.80
Celery	7.20
Relish	2.69
Eggs	14.74
Baked Beans	68.40
Cole Slaw	87.00
Ice Cream	160.00
Sodas	98.00
Ice Tea	39.00
Paper plates, napkins, forks, spoons	72.38
Labor	<u>504.00</u>

TOTAL	\$1,489.96
-------	------------

For per person planning, I have adjusted the figures somewhat to allow some flexibility.

Chicken per person @ 500 guests: \$3.38

Hot dogs per person @ 500 guests: \$3.37

Hamburgers per person @ 500 guests \$3.10

Approved \_\_\_\_\_

Disapproved \_\_\_\_\_



Date: June 15, 1977

## MEMORANDUM

## FOR ACTION:

Mrs. Carter

## FOR INFORMATION:

Frank Moore  
Gretchen Poston

FROM: Rick Hutcheson, Staff Secretary

## SUBJECT:

Frank Moore's memo regarding  
Congressional PicnicsYOUR RESPONSE MUST BE DELIVERED  
TO THE STAFF SECRETARY BY:

TIME:

DAY:

DATE:

## ACTION REQUESTED:

☒ Your comments - as requested by the President.  
Other:

## STAFF RESPONSE:

☒ I concur.  
Please note other comments below:☐ No comment.**PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.**

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please telephone the Staff Secretary immediately. (Telephone, 7052)



MEMORANDUM

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

CONFIDENTIAL

June 21, 1977

TO : The President

FROM: Jody Powell

RE : Rafshoon Memo

The contention that we are doing a T.V. event every few weeks in addition to your news conferences is, of course, incorrect.

The California event was designed to reach a segment of the country which receives our normal coverage at other than peak audience times. Reaction in the West was heavily favorable. Running behind Hollywood Squares and the soaps is no disgrace. The Republican energy extravaganza got about half the audience rating that your California Q&A received.

I agree that the post-news conference session should end since it cannot be confined to non-substantive matters.

I am not sure that a program such as the Republicans presented on energy would have been an appropriate alternative to your two speeches. It would have been criticized as gimmicky and show-biz. In addition, such a format is fine for presenting scatter-shot criticism but not so good for presenting a comprehensive, detailed program.

Finally, I believe that Jerry is on to a basic problem. I have discussed his memo with him.

What we need is to answer for ourselves the question of what the identifiable public themes of our administration should be. Although we agreed that we are indeed trying to do too much, we felt there was little hope of significantly reducing the number of activities; therefore, the answer was to identify and constantly reinforce three or four themes to give meaning to what is now to the public a confusing and unfocused series of actions and statements.

Jerry and Pat have agreed to get to work on this project immediately.

CONFIDENTIAL

"DETERMINED TO BE AN ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING  
CANCELLED FOR E.O. 12958, DEC. 1, 1993  
ARCHIVIST'S MARK OF E.O. 12958"

Electrostatic Copy Made  
for Preservation Purposes